



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/446,835	12/29/1999	GREGORY FENDIS	P06608US0/DE	2965
881	7590	07/17/2006	EXAMINER	
<b>STITES &amp; HARBISON PLLC</b> 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				MOSSER, ROBERT E
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3712		

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/446,835	FENDIS, GREGORY
	<b>Examiner</b> Robert Mosser	<b>Art Unit</b> 3712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-31, 34, 35 and 37-43 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-31, 34-35, 37-43 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/08/05</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

◆

**Claims 1-31, 34- 35, 37-43 are rejected.**

**Responsive to the RCE filed May 4<sup>th</sup> 2006.**

**This action is Non-final**

◆

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 4<sup>th</sup> 2006 has been entered.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 17, and 30 are objected to because of the following informalities: Each of the afore mentioned claims refer to a "transit" of data and in light of claim 31 this is understood to be a typographical error intended to refer to the "transmit/transmitting" of data. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 13-22, 29-31, 34-35, 37-38, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Colley** (US 5,283,733) or **Born** et al (US 5,949,679) in view of **Lobb** et al (5,810,680) in further view of **Luna** (US 5,324,028).

*[The Response to Arguments section presented below is incorporated herein]*

Regarding claims 1-5, 13-22, 29-31, 34-35, 37-38, and 41-43, Colley discloses a golf scoring/sport data collection system that includes a central score collection computer for accumulating, storing, manipulating golf scores, and providing through transmission said cumulative golf scores to a player at one or more of the golf terminals (Fig. 1, #1 & Col 3:60-65); a plurality of score input terminals for entering golf score data remotely, said terminals being distributed about a golf course so that one or more of said terminals are located in association with each hole of said course (Fig. 1, #3) and each of said terminals is provided with data indicative of its location (identification data); and communications means for communicating between said terminals and said central computer; whereby golf score data corresponding to a respective one of said holes can be entered into any one of aid one or more terminals

located in association with a respective hole and wherein said golf score data so entered and said data indicative of a respective location of a respective terminal (identification data) are transmitted to the central computer (also see written description-abstract', col. 1, lines 27-32 and lines 36-42).

Regarding claims **1-5, 13-22, 29-31, 34-35, 37-38, and 41-43**, Born teaches a golf

scoring/sport data collection system that includes a central score collection computer for accumulating, storing, manipulating golf scores, and providing through transmission said cumulative golf scores to a player at one or more of the golf terminals (Fig. 1, #12 & Col 5:46-56); a plurality of score input terminals for entering golf score data remotely, said terminals being distributed about a golf course so that one or more of said terminals are located in association with each hole of said course (Fig. 1, #14) and each of said terminals is provided with data indicative of its location (identification data); and communications means for communicating between said terminals and said central computer; whereby golf score data corresponding to a respective one of said holes can be entered into any one of aid one or more terminals located in association with a respective hole and wherein said golf score data so entered and said data indicative of a respective location of a respective terminal (identification data) are transmitted to the central computer (also see written description- abstract; col. 4, lines 9-14; col. 5, lines 5-16; col. 5, lines 26-29; col. 5, lines 57-64; col. 6, lines 29-39; col. 14, lines 4-6 and col. 14, lines 50-53).

Regarding claims **1-5, 13-22, 29-31, 34-35, 37-38, and 41-43**, Colley or Born teach the limitations of the claims above however, Colley or Born are silent regarding the newly added claim features of “a participant in said sport or game can play or progress through said phases in any order without providing said identification data to said respective data input means during said sport or game”. Lobb teaches an input unit that has a GPS tracked input unit that has the feature of data input means is associated without being entered during said sport or game along with providing the respective identification data indicative of a respective location in terms of phases of play in form of a graphical map (Abstract; Fig. 1; Fig. 2 and Fig. 2A and Fig. 5A). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features, as taught by Lobb, in the input means of Colley or Born to make the system more convenient for the user, whereby game play does not have to be interrupted to enter pertinent data. This would increase speed of play and make gaming more enjoyable.

The combination of either Colley or Born in view of Lobb arguably fails to disclose allowing the player's to progress through the game phases in any order as now claimed. In a related application however Luna teaches an intelligent golf parties guidance system which provides the players the ability to play the holes of a golf course out of their traditional numerical sequence (Abs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated the ability to allow golfers to play the holes of a golf course out of order as taught by Luna in the invention

of Colley/Lobb or Born/Lobb so that teams would avoid delays in play due to slower teams as taught by Luna (Col 1:10-27).

Claims **6-12, 23-28** and **39-40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Colley** or **Born** et al in view of **Lobb** et al (5,810,680), in further view of **Luna** (US 5,324,028) in yet further in view of **Lyon** (6,074,312).

Regarding claims **6-12, 23-28** and **39-40**, Colley or Born in view of Lobb/Luna teaches all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. The references lack the explicit disclosure of the data card and reader. However, as discussed in the previous office actions (papers #12 and #15), incorporated herein by reference, Lyon teaches this feature. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the similar golf score keeping teaching of Lyon encompassed on a smart card with the golf devices of Colley, Born and Lobb/Luna to make it easier for the users to store and keep track of their scores or alternatively provide the player with a portable copy of their golf statistics.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed May 4<sup>th</sup> 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that the invention of Luna fails to allow the players to play the holes of a golf course in any order (First page of Applicant's remarks dated May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2006). While the Applicant's arguments are directed the player's direct selection of the order in which the hole are played the present claim language reads, "whereby a participant in said sport or game can play or progress through said phases in any order chosen by the participant" (Pending Claim 1). The preceding language while encompassing the applicant's arguments is of a broader scope than argued by Applicant. When considered in view of the prior art of Luna, this correlates to allowing a participant to progress through the phases of a sport or game in any order chosen by the participant, so long as that order chosen by the participant, is the order determined by the system of Luna. The present claim amendment as addressed herein may suggest a broader ability as noted by the Applicant however remains encompassing the prior art as presented.

Further it is additionally noted that the Applicant is presently attempting to distinguish their claimed invention from that of the prior art through the incorporation of limitations directed toward intended use or equivalently intended functionality apparatus claims (Pending claims number 1-30, 41-43). In accordance with MPEP §2114 Apparatus claims must be structurally distinguishably from the prior art and cannot rely

on the manner of operation or function of the claimed apparatus to demonstrate a separation between a claimed invention and the prior art.

Finally, the Applicant argues the newly amended claim language directed to calculating a cumulative score from score data and transmitting the cumulative score data to the player's through one or more terminal devices this feature has been provided for in the teachings of Colley and Born in the rejection of claims presented above.

The Applicant provided translation of FR 2673116 has been reviewed. For purposes of this action and clarifying the record a supplemental copy of the IDS originally submitted April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2005 has been included to further indicate that the provided reference has been considered and that a translation of the same is included in it's consideration.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Mosser whose telephone number is (571)-272-4451. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

REM



MARK SAGER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER